



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

views. The two works were published at nearly the same time; but *Social Evolution* appeared just long enough in advance to allow Professor Drummond to embody an answer in express terms in his Introduction. Mr. Kidd's conclusions, he says,

show the impossible positions to which a writer, whose contribution otherwise is of profound and permanent value, is committed by a false reading of nature. Is it conceivable, *a priori*, that the human reason should be put to confusion by a breach of the law of continuity at the very point where its sustained action is of vital moment? The whole complaint, which runs like a dirge through every chapter of this book, is founded on a misapprehension of the fundamental laws which govern the processes of evolution. The factors of Darwin and Weismann are assumed to contain an ultimate interpretation of the course of things. For all time the conditions of existence are taken as established by these authorities.

And again :

To put the future of social science on an ultra-rational basis is practically to give it up. Unless thinking men have some sense of the consistency of a method, they cannot work with it, and if there is no guarantee of the stability of the results, it would not be worth while. But all that Mr. Kidd desires is really to be found in nature. There is no single element even of his highest sanction which is not provided for in a thorough-going doctrine of evolution. . . . When evolution comes to be worked out along its great natural lines, it may be found to provide for all that religion assumes, all that philosophy requires and all that science proves. . . . For nothing can ever be gained by setting one-half of nature against the other, or the rational against the ultra-rational. To affirm that altruism is a peculiar product of religion, is to excommunicate nature from the moral order, and religion from the rational order.

Perhaps the greatest service which Professor Drummond has rendered to the world lies in thus popularizing the conception of universal evolution.

MAX WEST.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

*Social England.* Edited by H. D. TRAILL. Vol. II: From the Accession of Edward I to the Death of Henry VII. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1894.—587 pp.

In a review of the first volume of this work (POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY, September, 1894), sufficient was said concerning the merits and demerits of the undertaking as a whole. Professor Maitland continues to give us his learned, yet graceful and witty, little essays on legal history; Mr. A. L. Smith hands on, with cautious

judgment, the Stubbsian tradition; Mr. Hubert Hall reveals the symmetry of the mediæval customs administration; Mr. W. H. Hutton writes upon the church with the sympathy of a humanist theologian born out of due time; Mr. R. L. Poole speaks with unapproachable authority on Wycliffe; and many other specialists, like Mr. Creighton and Mr. Oman, discourse on their several themes—untroubled by much concern for the opinions of their fellow-contributors. Of course it is a work that every fair historical library ought to have.

Such a book it were idle to attempt to criticise in detail. But it suggests the advisability of once more calling attention to a matter which has already been touched upon in these pages, in notices of the works of Thorold Rogers and Professor Cunningham, but which would seem to need constant reiteration. To Mr. W. J. Corbett have been assigned the sections on "Agriculture"; and he has produced for us some pleasantly written and suggestive pages. It falls to him to deal with the Black Death of 1349, and the Peasant Revolt of 1381; and, although their importance has doubtless been exaggerated, an adequate judgment concerning them certainly involves an intimate knowledge of contemporary conditions. But—most unfortunately, considering how many will learn their history from these pages—Mr. Corbett does but reproduce the theory of Thorold Rogers, with no attempt to supply for it the evidence which the master himself never adduced. After describing (page 98) the large extent to which labor dues from the villeins to their lords had been commuted for money payments, he explains the Peasant Revolt by the determination of the landlords "to revert wholesale to the personal services of former times" (page 246). It will hardly be believed by the reader that for this assertion there has not yet been produced a tittle of positive evidence. Yet here the argument *a silentio* is surely in place. Our evidence for the fourteenth century is not as complete as we should like; but it is considerable in bulk. Mr. Corbett hardly realizes what a big thing it is that he follows Mr. Rogers in imagining. It is inconceivable that, in those centuries when precedent so quickly became custom, scores of masters should have sought to disturb habits in their tenants of twenty, fifty, a hundred years' standing, and yet no trace of the "desperate expedient" should have come down to us. Doubtless services still uncommuted were more rigidly exacted, and there was, as a contemporary poet says, "a bitterer bid to the boon"; but this is very different from a "wholesale reversion" to "works" long since exchanged for "rent."

The causes of the rising were of course complex; but any one who will read through the accounts Walsingham gives us of the troubles of the convent of St. Albans with its tenants, will find there a picture of the situation in the rural districts most affected which needs no extraneous theory for its explanation.

The source of some other misapprehensions of the agrarian history of the fourteenth century which are evident in Mr. Corbett's narrative, is the failure to remember that rough-and-ready distinction between "laborers" and "tenants" which is drawn even by the statutes. Speaking in general terms it may be said that "laborers" did not take the place of "tenants" except in providing labor for the lord; they grew up beside them (being probably, in large part, identical with the "cotters"). The Statute of Laborers did not touch the substantial tenants; it touched only those who "had not of their own whereof they might live, nor proper land about whose tillage they might themselves occupy." The Peasant Rising, on the other hand, *was*, in the main, as Walsingham and Froissart and the Charters of Manumission sufficiently show, a rising of tenants. Accordingly "the increasing stringency of the Statutes of Laborers," to which Mr. A. L. Smith in part attributes the rising (page 153), had nothing directly to do with it, in the sense most readers will attach to his words; nor can it, as by Mr. Corbett, be called "the first struggle on a large scale between capital and labor in England" (page 252), without an undue straining of language.

One word more on another topic, already touched upon here (VI, 565), in reviewing Dr. Gross' *Gild Merchant*. Mr. Hubert Hall, in a section otherwise valuable and freshly thought out, goes beyond even Dr. Gross in believing it "probable" that at first "craftsmen formed in most towns a *majority* of the gild brethren," *i.e.*, of the merchant gild (page 110). It would be well if we could be shown the grounds for such an assertion: to the present writer, at least, it seems hard to fit it into what we know of gild history in England and elsewhere. And the further statement that "membership in the gild conferred the freedom of the borough and the legal status of burgess," is hardly reconcilable with the impression we get from the records, which is that, except in the case of lords of manors or heads of religious houses *outside* the town, the gild merchant was primarily an association of burgesses, *i.e.*, of persons who were already burgesses before they entered the gild.

W. J. ASHLEY.